

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL E. JACQUES,
Plaintiff,

v.

D. BAKER, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-cv-0830-JDP

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On September 15, 2025, defendants filed a motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, to revoke plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* status. ECF No. 19. To date, plaintiff has not filed a response.


To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his failure to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendants' motion. Plaintiff's

1 failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result
2 in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show
3 cause within twenty-one days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and
4 failure to comply with local rules. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall
5 file, within twenty-one days, an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendants' motion.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8
9 Dated: October 30, 2025


JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE